

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

YI SUN,

Plaintiff,

-v.-

HUGH H. MO; TSAI CHUNG CHAO;  
MAYOR ERIC LEROY ADAMS; THE LAW  
FIRM OF HUGH H. MO, P.C.; LI DA SUN;  
THE TOP ASIAN UNIFORMED NYPD  
OFFICERS, WHO ARE MEMBERS OF  
THE NYPD ASIAN-AMERICAN POLICE  
EXECUTIVES COUNCIL, AAPEX;  
NATURO-MEDICAL HEALTH CARE, P.C.;  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK; DET. STEVEN  
MATTHEWS; DET. BRYAN TROCKEL;  
DET. BRUNO VIDAL; SAM TSANG;  
DETECTIVE OR SUPERVISOR IN 72  
PRECINCT; and LIEUTENANT TIMOTHY  
CAI,

Defendants.

24 Civ. 3630 (KPF)

**ORDER**

KATHERINE POLK FAILLA, District Judge:

Plaintiff Yi Sun (“Plaintiff” or “Ms. Sun”), who is appearing *pro se*, has filed a fifth motion to stay the Court’s December 26, 2024 Order.<sup>1</sup> (*See* Dkt. #79). Plaintiff’s most recent motion includes a plea to Supreme Court of the United States to review this matter, because she believes that her case in the Southern District of New York was “rigged.” (*Id.* at 4).

As described in the December 26, 2024 Order, Defendant City of New York (the “City”) requested that the Court compel Plaintiff to provide the City

---

<sup>1</sup> The December 26, 2024 Order dismissed the action due to Ms. Sun’s continued failure to comply with Court orders. (Dkt. #67).

with a § 160.50 unsealing release, which was necessary in order for the City to conduct its investigation into Plaintiff's allegations, and copies of which had been sent to Plaintiff in March, April, July, and September 2024. (Dkt. #67 at 1-2). The Court repeatedly ordered Ms. Sun to provide the executed release to the City, so that the case could proceed. (Dkt. #28, 50, 60). The Court cautioned Ms. Sun that continued failure to comply with the Court's orders would result in sanctions, including dismissal of the case. (Dkt. #50, 60). Ms. Sun did not at any point represent to the Court why she would not provide the release or that she needed an extension of time to do so and ultimately did not provide the release. Having attempted to implement less drastic sanctions to no avail, the Court dismissed the case. (Dkt. #67).

On January 6, 2025, Plaintiff asked that the Order dismissing the case be stayed, and alleged that the Court issued the "self-serving" Order because the Court is prejudiced against Ms. Sun. (Dkt. #68 at 2). In response, the Court reiterated, as it has in past orders, that (i) Ms. Sun has provided no reasoning to support her claim that this Court is prejudiced against Plaintiff and (ii) the Court has no such personal bias or prejudice against Ms. Sun and dismissed the action because of Ms. Sun's repeated failure to comply with Court orders that were necessary to the continued prosecution of the case. (Dkt. #70).

On February 27, 2025, Plaintiff again sought a stay of the Order dismissing the case. (Dkt. #71-72). Ms. Sun claimed that the dismissal of this case was "rigged" and that this Court "used her power" to "cover-up the case

information.” (Dkt. #71 at 2, 4). Ms. Sun did not provide any support for those claims. In response, the Court again reiterated that the Court has no personal bias or prejudice against Ms. Sun and this action was dismissed because of Ms. Sun’s repeated failure to comply with Court orders. (Dkt. #73). The Court denied the motion. (*Id.*).

Ms. Sun then filed, on May 5, 2025, an “emergency motion or order to show cause for temporary restraining order to stay last order(s) etc[.]” (Dkt. #74 at 1). Ms. Sun again claimed that there had been “an abuse of power (by the Defendant-Judge) to retaliate against the litigant.” (*Id.* at 2). The Court, a third time, reiterated that the case was dismissed, not for some nefarious reason, but because Ms. Sun repeatedly failed to comply with the Court’s orders, such that the case could not move forward. Accordingly, the Court denied Ms. Sun’s motion.

On May 18, 2025, Ms. Sun filed a “motion or order to show cause for temporary restraining order to stay last order.” (Dkt. #77 at 1). The Court denied Ms. Sun’s request to stay previous orders, for the same reasons it denied her previous three motions regarding the December 26, 2024 Order.

Finally, on June 19, 2025, Ms. Sun again requested a temporary restraining order to stay the Court’s order dismissing the case. (Dkt. #79). The Court DENIES Ms. Sun’s most recent motion for the same reasons it has denied her previous motions regarding this Court’s order of dismissal. As the Court has now considered five meritless requests regarding its decision to close this case, Plaintiff is warned that, pursuant to the Court’s inherent authority

and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, further improper conduct, including the filing of additional meritless motions, may result in an order barring her from filing new actions without prior permission.

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order, to Plaintiff at her address of record and to terminate the pending motion at docket entry 79.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 26, 2025  
New York, New York



---

KATHERINE POLK FAILLA  
United States District Judge